

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Texas Instruments JTAG TAP Masters in view of Patavalis.

On May 22, 2006, an attorney for the applicant spoke by telephone with the Examiner and explained that the heart of the invention is that both the JTAG TAP and the JTAG TAP Master are both provided on the same chip with the core logic and that this was clearly stated in claim 1. The Examiner agreed that although the cited art shows all of the elements of claim 1, they are not shown all on the same chip and there is no suggestion in the cited references to put all these elements on the same chip. In fact, the art specifically provides for and suggests placing the elements on separate chips. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and the arguments regarding claim 1 apply to them as well. Independent claim 9 also claims that both the JTAG TAP and the JTAG TAP Master are both provided on the same chip with the core logic and the arguments regarding claim 1 apply to claim 9 as well. Claims 10 through 18 depend from claim 9 and the arguments regarding claim 1 apply to them as well. Independent claim 19 also claims that both the JTAG TAP and the JTAG TAP Master are both provided on the same chip with the core logic and the arguments regarding claim 1 apply to claim 19 as well. Claim 20 depends from claim 19 and the arguments regarding claim 1 also apply to claim 20.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



David P. Gordon
Reg. No. 29,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.
60 Long Ridge Road
Suite 407
Stamford, CT 06902
voice: (203) 323-1800
fax: (203) 323-1803

May 22, 2006